

REMARKS

The specification has been amended as shown above to clarify inherent properties of various elements within the opaque binder layer **16** and the light-dispersing layer **12**. Applicants submit that these amendments to the specification add no new matter.

Applicants amend claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 13-16, cancel claims 11, 12, 15 and 16, and add claims 17-38.

Claim 12, which was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim, has been cancelled. Applicants further cancel claim 11 without prejudice or estoppel.

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vance (US 5,781,344). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-4, which have been amended merely to define the invention more specifically, recite “a second layer of light-dispersing material having asymmetrical dispersion characteristics along orthogonal axes.” Asymmetrical dispersion of light along an axis facilitates expansion of a viewing angle.

In contrast, the filter disclosed in Vance “disperses transmitted light intensity at various angles relative to normal 11 of filter surface 18” (see, e.g., lines 62-65, col. 3), and there is no disclosure in Vance of a filter that disperses light asymmetrically or anisotropically. It is therefore respectfully submitted that amended claims 1-4 define the invention with sufficient particularity and distinctiveness to be patentable to Applicants.

Claims 5-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vance in view of Moshrefzadeh (US 6,417,966). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The prismatic lenses of amended claim 5 and the prisms of amended claim 9 asymmetrically disperse light in a “non-reflective manner.” Further the prisms of amended claim 9 disperse light “passing therethrough.” These aspects of the claimed invention avoid the need to coat the structures with a reflective surface, which is expensive.

In contrast, Moshrefzadeh discloses a dispersing film having surfaces that disperse light asymmetrically by reflection off of surfaces of structures 504. See, e.g., col. 11, lines 16-18. In Moshrefzadeh, light that is not reflected is absorbed, but light does not pass through the structures 504. See, e.g., col. 11, lines 16-32. It is therefore respectfully submitted that amended claims 5 and 9 now define the invention with sufficient particularity and distinctiveness to be patentable to Applicants.

Further, since claims 7 and 8 depend upon claim 5 and since claim 10 depends on claim 9, claims 7 and 8 also recite prismatic lenses that disperse light “in a non-reflective manner,” and claim 10 recites prisms that disperse light “in a non-reflective manner.” As noted above, Moshrefzadeh only teaches dispersion of light by reflection.

In addition, claims 7 and 8 specify additional limitations regarding the sloping surfaces of the prismatic lenses, namely, respectively, that “the sloping surfaces include multiple facets and different sloping angles” and “the sloping surfaces adjacent the surfaces normal to incident light slope at different angles.” These aspects of the claimed invention facilitate the asymmetrical dispersion of light through the filter.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 7, 8 and 10 now define the invention with sufficient particularity and distinctiveness to be patentable to Applicants.

Claim 6 has been amended to include “lenticular arrays” that have the inherent property of being able to disperse light asymmetrically. In contrast, Moshrefzadeh does not disclose “lenticular arrays.”

It is therefore respectfully submitted that amended claim 6 now defines the invention with sufficient particularity and distinctiveness to be patentable to Applicants.

Claims 13-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vance in view of DiLoreto (US 6,076,933). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 13 and 14 define a conformal layer in combination with a “second layer of light-dispersing material having asymmetrical dispersion characteristics.”

In contrast, although Vance in view of DiLoreto discloses a conformal layer having thickness of between 0.8R and 1.5R, Vance in view of DiLoreto does not disclose a conformal layer with a “second layer of light-dispersing material having asymmetrical dispersion characteristics.”

For at least this reason, Vance in view of DiLoreto does not show or suggest every element in claim 13 or 14 and therefore does not establish a *prima facie* case from which a proper determination can be made of unpatentability of these claims over this cited art.

Rejected claims 15 and 16 have been cancelled.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 13-14, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references – Vance (US

5,781,344), Moshrefzadeh (US 6,417,966), DiLoreto (US 6,076,933) – and over the references cited, but not applied -- Vance (US 5,563,738), Staehle (US 2,378,252), Suzuki (JP 05-216121) and Murata (JP 03-002855).

New claims 17-38 are submitted herewith to encompass the invention with the scope and breadth of claims coverage to which Applicants believe they are entitled in view of the cited art.

Favorable consideration and allowance of all claims are solicited.

Applicants invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below regarding any matter which may expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis W. Vance et al.

Date: July 2, 2003

By: Michelle K. Lee
Michelle K. Lee, Reg. No. 40,695
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel: (650) 335-7965
Fax: (650) 938-5200